

A project of this magnitude is certain to face a multitude of unknowns, and NASA has confronted many of them. As always in its courageous history, NASA has and will continue to overcome these obstacles and we will reap the rewards. Simply, the space station will maintain U.S. global leadership in space science and technology.

The unparalleled scientific research opportunities aboard the space station will enable advances in medicine and engineering. Most important are the health benefits that we have in the microgravity conditions in the space station. You cannot—no matter what technology you have—reproduce on Earth the gravity conditions that are in space. We know those microgravity conditions will allow us to watch the development of breast cancer cells and osteoporosis in a weightless environment. Perhaps this will help us find the cure for breast cancer, or we will learn how to combat osteoporosis.

The absence of gravity in the space station will allow new insights into human health and disease prevention and treatment, including heart, lung, and kidney function, cardiovascular disease, and immune system functions. The cool suit for Apollo missions now helps improve the quality of life of patients with multiple sclerosis. In recent years, NASA has obtained scientific data from space experiments that is five times more accurate than that on Earth. None of these benefits will be available in the future unless we have a space station on which we can perform adequate research.

Some will say that similar research can be conducted on the space shuttle. Although I believe valuable research should continue to be performed on the shuttle, the fact is, a longer period of time that can only occur on the space station is absolutely necessary for many important experiments.

During his last year in the Senate, Senator John Glenn spoke passionately in defense of the space station. He quoted a friend of mine, Dr. Michael DeBakey, chancellor and chairman of the surgery department at Baylor College of Medicine in Houston, TX, who said:

The Space Station is not a luxury any more than a medical research center at Baylor College of Medicine is a luxury. Present technology on the Shuttle allows for stays of space of only about 2 weeks. We do not limit medical researchers to only a few hours in the laboratory and expect cures for cancer. We need much longer missions in space—in months to years—to obtain research results that may lead to the development of new knowledge and breakthroughs.

So you take all these scientific wonders and ask: How does it make my life better? It does make our lives better. It makes our health better. It gives patients who have multiple sclerosis, osteoporosis, or cancer a better chance for a quality of life. I reject the idea that we would walk away from the space station and from the possibilities for the future for better health and better quality of life.

The international space station, along with the space shuttle program, is our future in one of the last unexplored regions of our universe. It will discover untold knowledge and could catapult us into a greater understanding of our world and, yet, undiscovered worlds. The space station will provide us with fantastic science, but that is only one of the known successes. The unknown successes are limitless.

Madam President, if we do not continue funding of the international space station at the anticipated cost levels, valuable experiments and progress will be abandoned. The project is long underway and, for the sake of future generations, we should not leave it unfinished. I look forward to working with the chairman and ranking member of this subcommittee to make sure we do fully fund the space station, but with strict requirements for budgetary control and making sure we do everything to keep our costs in line. But let's not walk away from this important research for our future.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JOHN NEGROPONTE TO BE THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I will speak for a few minutes about a problem that is hamstringing American foreign policy today, and that is the stalled nomination of John Negroponte to be the American Ambassador to the United Nations.

Even the critics of American foreign policy would agree that America, and the world, are best served by having an outstanding, experienced, professional diplomat at our U.N. mission in New York. Indeed, such a personal representative of the President would provide enlightened perspective to our friends and allies on occasions when we cannot support particular U.N. initiatives. He would also symbolize America's robust commitment to international engagement, and work with like-minded nations whenever possible

to advance our mutual interests and values, in the spirit of cooperation the United Nations was created to foster.

Regrettably, the Senate has stalled ambassador Negroponte's nomination process. The President announced his intention to nominate this 37-year veteran of the Foreign Service in March and sent his nomination to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in May. But his nomination has been held up due to concerns about human rights abuses in Honduras during his tenure as Ambassador there.

It is worth pointing out that Ambassador Negroponte has been confirmed by the Senate five times—as recently as 1993, well after his assignment to Honduras, as President Clinton's Ambassador to the Philippines. He did not then undergo anything like the ordeal he has been subjected to this year.

In the midst of the debate over Ambassador Negroponte's qualifications for the U.N. assignment, the United States got booted off the U.N. Human Rights Commission for the first time in its history—a defeat that raises credible doubts about the integrity of that institution and its commitment to the very values it exists to promote. Sudan, Libya, Syria, Cuba, and China are now members of this body, forged by the vision of Eleanor Roosevelt in the early post-World War II era—and we are not.

Victims of persecution around the world, and advocates for their cause in our country, shall long rue the day the Commission was tarnished by this unfortunate vote. Many professionals agree that had we had an ambassador in place early in this administration, we would now be a member in good standing of the Human Rights Commission. We also recently lost our seat on the International Narcotics Control Board, another avoidable consequence of our vacant U.N. ambassadorship.

Ambassador Negroponte has the strong support of Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, his predecessor at the United Nations. Upon hearing the first reports of the President's intent to nominate Ambassador Negroponte, Ambassador Holbrooke said: The United States is lucky, the U.N. is lucky. . . . He is a real professional. . . . I would be thrilled.

Secretary of State Colin Powell recently called John Negroponte: one of the most distinguished foreign service officers and American public servants I have ever known.

The U.N. General Assembly convenes in mind-September for its annual session. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee should immediately schedule a confirmation hearing for Ambassador Negroponte, to take place in early September when the Senate reconvenes, in order to have him confirmed and in place to represent our Nation in New York this fall.

Ambassador Negroponte has served Democratic and Republican Presidents with distinction over the course of his diplomatic career. In the spirit of bipartisanship and the proud tradition of

American internationalism at the United Nations, I urge my colleagues to move quickly to allow this good man to serve our country once again.

Madam President, I have had the opportunity of knowing Ambassador Negroponte when he was Ambassador to Mexico, Ambassador to Honduras, and Ambassador to the Philippines. The nomination is now stuck. Unfortunately, we need to act as quickly as possible.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter from Mr. George Shultz, former Secretary of State, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

July 17, 2001.

HOOVER INSTITUTION—

ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE,

Hon. JOSEPH R. BIDEN,

Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN, I am writing to support the nomination of John Negroponte to be our Ambassador to the United Nations. I know him well; I have worked with him closely. I believe he will do an outstanding job at the UN.

While I was Secretary of State, John Negroponte served in three different positions: (1) Ambassador to Honduras; (2) Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Scientific and Environmental Affairs; and (3) Deputy National Security Advisor in the last fourteen months of the Reagan administration.

In Honduras, John did an outstanding job under especially difficult circumstances. There was turmoil and instability throughout Central America, and assisting Honduras to stay on an even keel was an enormous challenge. Despite the difficulties, Honduras managed to maintain relative calm and peace compared to neighboring El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua and made the transition from military to civilian rule during his time there. Honduras has had five free elections for a civilian president since 1981, and there will be another such election later this year. Much of the groundwork for the return to democracy and rule of law in Honduras was laid during John's tenure.

John's work as Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, his next assignment, is an excellent example of the richness and diversity of his background and experience. As Assistant Secretary for OES, John oversaw the negotiation of the Montreal Protocol for the Protection of the Stratospheric Ozone Layer on behalf of the United States. This was a milestone multilateral environmental agreement at the time and I well remember the conviction and skill with which John worked to gain support within the U.S. government and to conclude such an agreement with other countries. The Senate vote to consent to ratification was 83 to 0. John's portfolio in OES included addressing the issue of acid rain and its impact on Canada, and dealing with fisheries in the South Pacific. He personally negotiated and renewed a space cooperation agreement with the Soviet Union, satisfying the technology transfer concerns of a wary and skeptical DOD along the way. And at my request, John worked with former Citibank CEO Walter Wriston to organize a symposium at the National Academy of Sciences about the impact of information technology on foreign policy.

As Deputy National Security Advisor, John dealt with the entire range of national

security issues confronting the President and the National Security Council. Among the important issues with which he had to deal on a daily basis at that time were the Iran-Iraq war, the end of Soviet military involvement in Afghanistan, and two summits between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev.

Although it was after my tenure as Secretary of State, I also had the opportunity to visit John both in Mexico City and Manila where he subsequently served as Ambassador. I can attest to the outstanding job he did at each of those posts. John was instrumental in both the conception and negotiation of the NAFTA, which has brought dramatic, positive changes to the U.S./Mexico economic and political relationship.

John has had a broad and deep variety of foreign policy experience at eight foreign postings and assignments in Washington at both the State Department and the White House. This experience is excellent preparation for the challenges of a UN assignment.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE P. SHULTZ.

Mr. MCCAIN. Finally, Madam President, we really need to have the United States represented at the United Nations. This has been a long process for Mr. Negroponte. I know my good friend and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, JOE BIDEN, shares my concern about the United Nations. He is a committed believer in the United Nations and the importance of its functions. I hope we will move forward as quickly as possible with Mr. Negroponte's nomination to represent the United States at the United Nations.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hosted a briefing for interested Senators by Dr. Condoleezza Rice on Monday afternoon in the Capitol during which she discussed with almost 20 Senators who were present the recent meetings she had with Russian leaders in Moscow.

I was impressed with the steadfast resolve of the President during his meetings with President Putin in Genoa in moving beyond the confrontational relationship with Russia and replacing the doctrine of mutual assured destruction with a new framework that would be consistent with our national defense interests as they now exist rather than as they existed in 1972.

Two years ago, Congress debated and passed the National Missile Defense Act of 1999, which enunciated the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as technologically possible a system to defend the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack, whether accidental, unauthorized, or intentional. That bill was passed with overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Congress and signed into law on July 23, 1999.

The National Missile Defense Act became necessary because of two unfortunate facts: The emergence of a new threat to our Nation and our lack of

capability to defend against that threat. The threat stems from the proliferation of the technology to build long-range ballistic missiles.

Our inability to defend against that threat is tied to the ABM Treaty of 1972. The changes that have occurred in the world since the cold war had not been reflected in our national policy until the enactment of the National Missile Defense Act.

President Bush is moving ahead to fulfill both the letter and spirit of the National Missile Defense Act. He has restructured the Missile Defense Program from one that was carefully tailored not to conflict with the 1972 ABM Treaty into one which will provide the best defense possible for our Nation in the shortest period of time. He has properly focused the Missile Defense Program on the threat we face rather than the ABM Treaty, and he has clearly stated he intends to move beyond the cold war ABM Treaty and into a new era in which the United States does not base its security on pledges of mutual annihilation with a country with which we are not at war.

The President has personally carried this message to our allies, friends, and former adversaries, and his efforts have met with impressive success. Not all critics have been persuaded and some never will be, but many who were skeptical now support our efforts, and some, such as the Premier of Italy just last week in Genoa, have enthusiastically endorsed them.

Perhaps the most striking change has occurred in Russia. When the previous administration proposed modifications to the ABM Treaty, the Russian Government refused even to entertain the notion, but in the face of the resolve demonstrated by President Bush, the Russian Government has agreed to his suggestion to enter into talks to establish an entirely new strategic framework to guide the relationship between our countries. The developments of the past few months are truly changing the international political world we have known for so long.

At the same time, our Missile Defense Program, which for years had been underfunded, is continuing to recover and is making substantial technical progress. That program has faced formidable obstacles—besides the technical challenge of reliably intercepting ballistic missiles. It has faced the constraints of an old treaty that was intended specifically to impede and prohibit the development and deployment of such missile defenses.

Congress has taken the lead over the past few years in helping to get the Missile Defense Program back on its feet by increasing the funding available for the work on defenses against both shorter range and longer range ballistic missiles, and those programs have demonstrated great progress. The Patriot PAC-3 system has succeeded in 7 out of 8 intercept attempts against shorter range ballistic missiles, such as the Scuds that caused such destruction